

THE  
**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**

AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

JUNE, 1833.

---

ART. I. *Letter from Rome.*

ROME, (ITALY,) MAY 1st, 1832.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,

I AM NOW on the eve of leaving Rome, where I have been for a month. In this famous city there is much to admire and much to deplore. It was once styled the Eternal City and Goddess of the Earth; and the immense remains of Antiquity, here to be seen, excite the astonishment and admiration of every beholder, and prove the grandeur and magnificence of this ancient Mistress of the world. If the ruins are so great and wonderful, what must have been the splendour and magnificence of the city itself in all its pristine glory. Its ancient walls, fifteen miles in circumference, are still standing, precluding access to the city except through the gates, some of which were constructed before the commencement of the christian æra. The extensive and massy remains of ancient Baths, Aqueducts, and other public edifices, especially the palace of the Cæsars, are exceedingly interesting. But the most astonishing ruins in Rome, and perhaps in the world, is the Coliseum or Amphitheatre, which covers more than five acres, whose outer wall, at present, is more than one hundred and fifty feet in height, and which contained room within for more than seventy thousand spectators, who sat and saw, for amusement and sport, men murdering men, and Christians killed by wild beasts!

In this city are still to be seen the ruins of ancient Temples, in which, about two thousand years ago, the heathen "worshipped devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which are by nature no gods." Most of these ruins are repaired, and converted into places of Roman Catholic worship. The Pantheon, which contained a collection of the Heathen Deities, and which was built long before Christ was born, still remains nearly perfect, and is considered one of the finest specimens of ancient architecture. Here too, are to be seen the very altars on which the ancient Romans offered in sacrifice, those victims which the scripture says, "they sacrificed to devils and not to God." And here too, are to be seen a multitude of the very idols, which the ancient Greeks, and Romans, and Egyptians, and other heathen nations, worshipped. In the collection is to be seen Jupiter, Mercury, Diana of Ephesus, and idols from Egypt, and other parts of the world, conquered by the Roman arms. "Professing themselves to be wise, they

became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man; and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things;—who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator who is blessed forever. Amen.” But alas! how much better is Rome Christian, than Rome Pagan! How much better is the reign of Anti-christ, than the reign of heathenish darkness, and Pagan idolatry, and superstition! This imperial seat of the Cæsars has long since become “the seat of the Beast,” “that man of sin, and son of perdition, who opposeth, and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God;” and hath persecuted unto the death, multitudes of the faithful followers of the Lamb.

The Roman Catholics have here many most magnificent churches, as they call them, adorned with precious stones, and sculptured and carved work, and garnished with images, altars, paintings, and crosses; before which they bow down to worship. Some of these images, particularly the paintings, more especially some in the Pope’s Chapel, are executed and exhibited in a manner which not only religion forbids, but common decency condemns. These images, altars, crosses, and paintings, are set up, not only in their chapels, but in their dwelling-houses, by the highway, at the corner of the streets, at all places of public resort, and even in the ruins of antiquity.

The Pope and Cardinals, and other priests, are “clothed in fine linen, and purple and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls.” They perform their ceremonies with great pomp, apparent solemnity, and seeming sanctity. It is truly most affecting to witness their abominable idolatries, superstitions, and will-worship. The humiliating scene prompts the spectator to exclaim—Is this worshipping God, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth? Are these the “beauties of holiness?” Where are “the saints of Cæsar’s household?” Where is the Apostolic Church of “Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints,—whose faith is spoken of throughout the whole world?” One may see here what Paul saw at Athens,—“a city wholly given to idolatry.” And one might say to these Roman Catholics what that fearless and faithful Apostle, when his spirit was stirred within him, said to those polite Athenians, “I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious; God who made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is God of all, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men’s hands as though he needed any thing. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like to gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device.”

The Roman Catholic religion is a strange compound of heathenish idolatry and superstition, with the abrogated rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic economy, and the doctrines and ordinances of Christianity, most impiously corrupted, and perverted. Nothing it seems can be done in religion, without bowing down before an image, picture, or cross. There is more reverence paid to the Pope, Cardinals, and other dignitaries, than to the Most High. There is more praying to departed saints, especially the Virgin Mary, than to God. There is more trusting in self, than in Jesus Christ for salvation. It is said that the more intelligent, in the higher classes, both among the priests and people are sunk into infidelity. To the rest, religion is a system of pharisaical self-righteousness, and formality. It is a system of error, blasphemy, and iniquity, which robs God of his glory, and is fully fraught with total and eternal ruin to the immortal souls of men. Where this “mystery of iniquity prevails, there is

the reign of tyranny, temporal and spiritual; there is the dominion of darkness and death."

The Cathedral of "St. Peter's," is the largest and most magnificent building of the kind in the world. It cost fifty-seven millions of dollars, before it received all its grand and costly decorations. Among the multitude of the wonderful things which it contains is a bronze image of the Apostle Peter, sitting in a chair raised upon a pedestal. Some have said that this is the very image of Jupiter worshipped by the ancient Romans, but it is most probable that it was cast out of the fragments of an immense image of that supreme heathen deity, as it is an exact copy of an ancient marble statute of that Apostle, kept in the lower part of the building; and as it represents him holding keys in one hand, and with the other making a gesture, as if in the act of preaching, or rather, pronouncing a benediction. The front part of the right foot projects over the pedestal, and thus conveniently exposed, the great toe receives the kisses of all classes, from the Pope, down to the poorest beggar, which ceremony has been so often repeated, that the solid metal is half worn away. This degrading ceremony, is also performed upon the images, relics, and even upon wooden crosses, erected in public places. The adoration of relics, of which there is no scarcity, is common. On a certain day in "St. Peter's," there is a brilliant display of these pretended precious and sacred things, particularly the sponge, in which, vinegar was administered to Christ, a part of his seamless vesture, and a piece of the very cross, on which he was crucified, said to be brought to Rome from Jerusalem, by Constantine's mother. The people firmly believe that the saints, especially the Virgin Mary, can work miracles. Over the doors of the chapels, is written, "perpetual plenary indulgences for the living and dead;" and frequently over the altars, "mass for the souls in purgatory." Billets are stuck up in public places announcing the death of great personages, requesting prayers for their departed souls. Labels are often to be seen directing to the repetition of certain prayers for a definite number of times, and to the performance of certain ceremonies, such as kissing an image, cross or relic, and promising for these things indulgence for a large but definite number of days. In and around Rome, are many great and grand buildings, said to be erected by Constantine, one of which, about three miles from the city, is built over what is shown to be the tomb of the Apostle Paul and about three miles farther, is pointed out the spot, where he suffered martyrdom. The Apostle Peter's tomb is said to be in the lower part of the Cathedral, called by his name. Immediately before the high altar, and above the Apostle's grave, is a circular opening in the floor or marble pavement of the building, surrounded by many large lamps, kept constantly burning. Around this opening, the Pope and the people bow down, to pray to him, whom they believe to be the foundation of the Church, and the keeper of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The Vatican is like a city for magnitude, and like a palace for the vast number of its great and grand apartments, which are some of the first specimens of architecture in the world. The Vatican library, one apartment of which is nearly half a mile long, is adorned with paintings and antique pillars of marble, and contains, besides an immense collection of books, many very old, and rare manuscripts of the holy scriptures, and the writings of ancient profane authors. Some of these manuscripts are exceedingly beautiful specimens of hand-writing. Some of them are written in letters of gold, and ornamented with exquisitely fine paintings, in brilliant colors on the margin. In this place are kept among many other rare and curious things, the instruments of cruelty, with which the primitive Christians were tortured to death. The Vatican museums are very extensive, con-

taining the choicest specimens of the fine arts, both ancient and modern. Among the things of this immense collection, are to be seen the paintings of the most famous modern masters, which make a person wonder, that with canvass and colour alone, objects can be so represented as if life and reality were before your eyes. These museums contain vast numbers of antique statues of the most renowned men of antiquity, and antique images of the idols of ancient Greece and Rome, and other parts of the world. No wonder that the fine arts are brought in modern times to such a high degree of perfection in Italy, for it is the very genius of the Roman Catholic Religion, to give the greatest encouragement to sculpture, painting, music and architecture. It is a religion well adapted to please the eye, and ear, and corrupt heart of man. To see the Pope arrayed in his splendid pontifical robes, with the golden tiara or triple crown, bespangled with precious stones, upon his head; to see multitudes of cardinals, canons, prelates and priests gorgeously dressed and decked, bowing down obsequiously to kiss his hand or embrace his foot; and to see the pomp and apparent solemnity, sanctity and sincerity with which their ceremonies are performed, is a scene well calculated to delude the poor ignorant people, and excite them to blind devotion. They are kept in the most abject state of ignorance. When asked for a bible, they give directions to go to the priests. When asked to repeat the ten commandments, they invariably omit the second, of which they know nothing, and divide the tenth to make up the number. Although they seem to feel their religion to be a galling yoke, and an intolerable burden; yet they love to have it so, because it gives them liberty to live in sin, and at the same time, to entertain the firmest hopes of heaven. If we were to judge of the excellence of religion from the morals of the people in Protestant and Roman Catholic Countries, there is not much reason to fear, that in the comparison, Popery would fall before Protestantism, as Dagon fell before the Ark of God. To mention but one or two things, in these catholic countries, it is rare to find a person possessed of common honesty; and the public services of the Sabbath, are over by mid-day, and the afternoon and evening, by both priests and people, are devoted to pleasure and pastime. The Pope's temporal power and pomp is wonderfully brought down, although his spiritual authority and influence is great, not only in Europe but other parts of the world. He has not now, as he once had, crowns and kingdoms at his disposal, and inexhaustible treasures to lavish away, at his pleasure. But propped up by the Emperor of Austria, this "mystery of iniquity" still worketh and will work "until he that letteth will take it out of the way." How long shall "the man of sin and son of perdition oppose, and exalt himself above all that is called God?" When will "the Lord consume that wicked one, with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of his coming?" When will the reign of Anti-Christ be over, and the fall of the Mystical Babylon, and the Kingdom of the Beast be finished? "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus, who loved not their lives unto the death?" O, when will divine light, truth and holiness universally prevail, and gloriously triumph over all ignorance, error, superstition, idolatry and ungodliness?

Surely if Protestants were better acquainted with the sad state of spiritual blindness and bondage, in which the people in Roman Catholic Countries are kept, they would prize their christian light, liberty and privileges more highly, improve them more diligently, and pray more frequently and fervently for the destruction of every Anti-Christian principle and practice. Let them bless God for the glorious Reformation, which has been productive of both civil and religious liberty, to so many



millions of mankind. Let them beware of trusting in whole or in part to their own righteousness, but hold fast the doctrine of justification by the free grace of God, through faith in the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ. This was the corner stone of the Reformation, which was sealed by the blood of those who "were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus, which they held." Having made a good profession before many witnesses, let them "hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering, for he is faithful, who hath promised." In a world so full of error and ungodliness, let them "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints." Let them cling closely to Christ and his cause, so much despised and opposed in countries called Christian and Protestant. Let them beware of formality, delusion and hypocrisy, lest they "hold the truth in unrighteousness," and the "light in them be darkness." Let not their lives belie their profession, but adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour, walking in all his ordinances and commandments, blameless. It will be more tolerable for poor blinded Roman Catholics in the day of judgement, than for enlightened Protestants, if they misimprove the light, liberty and privileges, which they enjoy. If "judgement begin at the house of God, what shall be the end of them, who obey not the gospel of God?"

There is no place of Protestant worship within the walls of Rome, but beyond one of the gates is a room used for the Episcopalian service.

Had I time and space, I could give you more interesting particulars, but I know not how nor when this letter will reach you.

Yours in the bonds of Christian affection,

THOMAS GOODWILLIE.

---

ART. II. *The Parts of the Revelation that exhibit the Church in our own Time, considered.*

[Continued from Vol. IX.]

I SHALL NOW offer some observations on the *opposition* which the serpent makes against her. It is said to have been the remark of an eminent minister, that all the opposition which has been made to the church, has been either by *force* or *fraud*; and he had good authority for it; for the spirit of God has classed it all under the same two heads, in the following words: "He (Christ) shall deliver the needy when he crieth, the poor also, and him that hath no helper. He shall spare the poor and needy, and shall save the souls of the needy. He shall redeem their soul *from deceit and violence*," &c., Ps. lxxii. 12, 13, 14. Now, the opposition here made by the devil, is classed precisely under the same two heads. He "persecuted her," ver. 13; this is violence or force, and he cast out of his mouth water as a flood after her; this comprehends fraud and deception of the most deep and hellish sort.

As to persecution or force, I am of opinion that the devil still pursues the woman in this way. It is true we have not very lately heard of any one being beheaded, or burnt, for believing in the truth. But force can be applied in various ways and under various false pretences. The Emperor Julian did not persecute any one directly and formally, for professing the truth, but he made such laws as he knew a Christian could not in conscience obey, and then he put them to death for not obeying the laws. And we have lately seen an instance, in this blessed and free country, of something not exceedingly unlike this, in the case of the

Cherokee Missionaries; enough to prove that this malicious serpent-cunning has still a place on the earth, and has not ceased entirely to act. When laws are made, the keeping of which is a direct violation of the institutions of the Christian religion, it is unquestionably pursuing the woman by force; and such are some of the standing laws of this country respecting Sabbath mails. When the property of such as are in public capacity, adhering to the truth, is taken from them iniquitously, by a course of law, it must be classed under the same head. When the apostatising part of the professing community, "speak evil of the way of truth," and set forth a host of calumnies against those that continue to love it, it really amounts to force, and though not so frightful to the eyes of flesh as the old fashioned way, of first excommunicating and then handing over to the civil power to be burnt as heretics, it is equally pregnant with the bitter hate of the serpent, and not less disastrous to the cause of truth; neither is it by any means unproductive of evil consequences to this temporal life.

And I am persuaded that if a fair calculation of these different ways of force were made, that the modern way would, in the aggregate, mightily preponderate over the old way. The Pope was obliged to direct his power against individuals, or very small numbers at a time, but we have contrived a system of such prodigious power, that it can *thrust* away from the truth a *whole generation*. Indications of that same spirit, which soaked the earth with Protestant blood, are still numerous, and it only waits for the removal of restraints put on it by the providence of God, to use similar violence again. Indeed every error is, when consistently and fully followed out, a principle of persecution, as necessarily as its opposite truth is a principle of meekness and peace.

I have said that the waters which he casts out of his mouth as a flood, comprehend fraud and deceit, under which I class all unscriptural tenets and doctrines of men, whether they respect matters of faith or of practice. That this is the meaning of it, is inferable from the distinction that is here made in the serpent's opposition, between persecution and the waters of the flood. For as the former includes all the different ways in which *violence* is done to the woman, so these waters must, in like manner, include all the different ways by which he has endeavored to blind her understanding, and lead her astray. These waters are "cast out of the mouth," and what else but doctrines or sentiments can the *mouth* cast out? and when we consider what is meant particularly by the devil's *mouth*, in this place, it is still more manifest that doctrines are included.

The *mouth* in question, is that which Daniel beheld in "the little horn speaking great things," ch. vii. 8. These great things are, in the explanation, called "words against the Most High," ver. 25. In the next chap. they are called "casting down *truth* to the ground," ver. 12. And Revelation xiii. 5, 6, "there was given to him a mouth speaking great things and *blasphemy*—and he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven—ver. 14. And he *deceives* them that dwell upon the earth." This mouth, in 2 Thess. ii. 4. 9, 10, 11, claims to be above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, and as God to sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.—It speaks "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness"—and "strong delusion that they should believe a lie." These texts not only prove that this mouth casts forth the waters of erroneous and false doctrine, but that it also rejects the testimony of God in the Scriptures, and claims to *itself* the right to give out what shall be and what shall not be matters of faith and practice. All this is represented as from *one mouth*; but it cannot be taken properly for one only, any more than

we can understand by the "man of sin," only one individual. For this is a *mouth* which continues to speak these *great things* through the whole 1260 days or years. It must, therefore, have a succession of persons and generations, disposed thus to speak in the service of the dragon.—And I see no reason for confining it to a succession of Popes and the clergy under him. It must include *every mouth* that speaks under the influence and for the interest of the dragon during this period—every mouth which puts aside the testimony of God, to make way for its own dogmas. For upon the same principle that the Spirit here sets down the doctrines of the Pope and his creatures, to the account of the dragon, while they avow and profess to be abhorring such a connection, and to be serving Christ alone, we may justly set over to the account of Popery every doctrine which it comprehends, although it be taught by those professing to abhor Popery. The justice of this will appear from the fact that the Apostle John, in his first Epistle, sets the heresies that were rising up in his own day, to the account of Anti-Christ, even before Anti-Christ had, in his own proper form, come into existence. And from this instance we also learn that it is just to call those doctrines popish, which may be fairly deduced from any popish tenet, although the Pope or his clergy never expressly avowed or taught them. It will, no doubt, be perceived that this ascribes a wide and deep course to the *waters* of the dragon, and includes many a mouth, this day, which would open itself wide to pour forth indignation upon an application of this sentiment.

The consideration of the term "*waters*," will lead us to a similar conclusion with respect to the nature of this opposition. Waters are used diversely, to signify deep afflictions. The Psalmist says, "I am come into deep waters." Sometimes to denote the invasion of an overwhelming army :—"Now, therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria." Isa. viii. 7. But the waters in question are distinguished from these, and all others, by this circumstance, that they are the waters of the *mouth*. The waters of the mouth are the counsels of the heart, expressed by the *words* of the mouth. This is clear from Prov. xx. 5, "Counsel in the heart of man is like deep water, but a man of understanding will draw it out."—Compare with chap. xviii. 4, "The words of a man's mouth are as deep waters, and the well spring of wisdom as a flowing brook." More particularly the counsel of God, as expressed in the doctrines of grace, and the preaching of the Gospel, are very often set forth under the term waters. The following are a few instances :—"With joy shall ye draw *water* out of the wells of salvation." Isa. xii. 3. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters," chap. lv. i. "Thou wouldest have asked of him and he would have given thee *living water*." John iv. 10. "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of *living water*," chap. vii. 38. "And whosoever will, let him come and take of the *water* of life freely." Rev. xxii. 17. Now, it must be kept in mind, that although the Lord Jesus here discovers to his servants that these waters of opposition to the woman come from the mouth of the dragon, this has not at any time been avowed by those that pour them forth, but the very opposite of this; they have always professed that they were the doctrines of the Gospel—the true grace of God—the true doctrine of the Bible,—the only doctrine that can lead to salvation. They come professing to be the water which satisfies and refreshes the thirsty soul, and not the poison of dragons, which kills it. There has never yet been a sentiment brought to bear on the faith or practice of the saints, for which this much has not been claimed, There is not a single teacher of errors, this day, among the thousands, that will not claim for his doctrine the name of Gospel—"glad tidings of

great joy." Yet they are those waters "that have become wormwood, and many men die of them, because they are made bitter." Rev. viii. 11.

Having determined the meaning of these waters, let us next take notice of the comparison introduced. These waters are cast forth "*as a flood*," for multitude—for having no regular channel—no barrier—because they are turbid and filthy—and because they beat with incessant violence against whatever stands in their way, until it yields and is carried away. All these points of resemblance to a flood could be easily pointed out in the doctrines of the dragon, at any given time within the 1260 days, but never with greater ease than at present. Their multitude can scarcely be calculated, whether we consider the number employed in pouring them forth, or the multifarious ways and methods used to convey them, or the multitude of different opinions that are propagated. If you subtract from the aggregate of all that is called Christian doctrine in the world, only that which teaches to expect justification by faith in the righteousness of Christ *imputed*, it would scarcely be discernibly diminished. And if the number of those who teach this doctrine were to be cut off, it would be only like cutting off two witnesses from the whole body of professed teachers, or like taking Elijah away from the number of Baals prophets. I need not offer any proof that this flood has no regular channel. This is a thing that has always been manifest. There is, in many instances, the semblance of respect to the order which God has set up in his word; while in other instances it is openly discarded in part or in whole, and a new order, of men's contriving, set up in its stead. But even where it *seems to be* regarded, it is only because it stands not in *the way* of these waters. It takes but little acquaintance with what has been doing for fifty years past, to know that powerful efforts have been making to subvert the whole order of the Reformed Churches, and to form religious society upon a new model, altogether different. Doctrine, worship, and practice are all conducted on a new plan. Christian and ministerial fellowship is carried on upon a new footing, and is itself a new thing. The work of the church, as defined in the word of God, is laid off in parcels, and undertaken by as many new voluntary associations, upon their own assumed principles, but as a matter of choice, and not of indispensable obligation. Neither need there be much illustration offered, that it has no barrier. The word of God is no barrier to it, because it is either not consulted at all, or it is assumed without proof to be on their side. Creeds and Testimonies are cried down by popular acclamation as antiquated forms. Oaths, Covenants and Ordination vows are no barrier; new light shows a man how to get over them, with the greatest ease. Sound argument is confuted, by simply paying no attention to it. Fairness, candour and common decency are readily surmounted by zeal for the souls of sinners. They must be compelled, literally compelled to come in. They must be assailed, (yet so as they shall not know how,) in their dwellings, in the schools, where their children are taught common education, in their places of worship. The new doctrine must be thrust in before them, and they compelled to swallow it.\*

Consistency of character is no hindrance, because until now, men had not found out the *right way*—all the past was but the errors and the bigotry which they had inherited from their half enlightened fathers. This *flood is turbid and filthy*. It is such a flood as follows a storm. It comes after "the winds blow and the rains descend," and beats against the house of the soul, and that which is founded only on the sand will fall.

\* Not long ago the congregation of a certain Rev. Dr., in the State of New-York, were surprised to find in every pew of the meeting house, a copy of the constitution of another ecclesiastical body!! Such is the spirit of this Jesuitical age.



That it is filthy, you may easily perceive, for those who swim in it as their native element, and those who drink it as the thirsty ox doth the water, continue as filthy and polluted as ever. The flood of opinions and doctrines, now overflowing is nothing at variance with vanity and ostentation of the most disgusting and shameless degree, or with deceit and hypocrisy, or with a carnal conversation, or a worldly mind, or with pride and self-sufficiency, all which, the scriptures denominate abominable filthiness. Such things and others of worse name, still are not only to be seen, but maintained and defended in those who are earnest and sincere in these doctrines.

Farther, as an evidence of the filthiness of these waters, you will observe, that it is perfectly congenial to the dog, who has returned to his own vomit, (the professor who has apostatized, and returned to his old sins,) to lap them, and to the sow who was washed, to wallow in them. Filthy, brutish, sensual men, who cast off all regard to divine institutions, or who never had any; find nothing in the many new schemes of religion, so opposed to their lusts as to hinder them from taking part, or even from going foremost in them. *This flood beats with incessant violence against whatever stands in its way till it yields. To cause the woman to be carried away,* is its main design; to cause her to be carried away from her place, and from those that nourish her. And I understand it, that if she would drink of these waters, if she would embrace the new doctrine and order of things, if she would get over her covenant engagements to the Lord Christ, and her scrupulous tenacity to points of present testimony, points of Church government, worship and discipline, and would follow the multitude, saying "a confederacy" to all she met, and cease to be peculiar in her views and practice; she *would* be carried away. To effect these things, is the design of this flood. The multiplicity of its opinions is to confound and perplex a man, so that he may lose his way, and in that manner be carried off. The disregarding of all sound argument set up against it, and all objections made to it, and the assuming the correctness of its own opinions, and incessantly pressing them on the attention, is another way by which this flood comes away. And it is admirably calculated for the purpose, for it is well known that what has been invincible to force, and could not be gained by argumentation, or compassed by art, has often been effected by incessant importunity alone. The success of the widow's importunity with the unjust judge, may, without impropriety be adduced as an illustration of this. By these means, this flood has carried away many a particular Church already, and it is obvious to every one, whose eyes are yet open, that it is now bearing down upon the remains of the Reformation Societies with tremendous pressure. And what the event, as to them may be, God only knows; but there are many, very many things to justify a fear, that they will all give way. But though they should, the woman will be preserved.

I shall now make some remarks on the means by which the woman is to be preserved. And they are three in number; two wings of a great Eagle, that she might fly to her place,—a place prepared of God, where she is to be fed and nurished,—and the earth opening its mouth and swallowing this flood, which was designed to carry her away. As to the first, the two wings of a great Eagle is the symbol, and its meaning follows—"that she may fly." Under this is couched a promise and an assurance, that so long as flight shall be the duty and safety of the woman, God in his providence, will provide the means and make a way for it, and the means will be adapted to the end. When she has to make her escape from a flood which is overflowing and passing over every where, and coming unto the hiding-place, and reaching even to the neck, it would serve her little purpose to be swift of foot only, but God provides what

is adapted to her emergency—*Wings of a great Eagle*; by these she can leave the earth, and mount up to the lofty summit of her eternal rock, Christ, where no flood can reach her.

Let the reader here carefully observe, that her safety is represented to be in flight. In order to understand how to use this means of safety, observe, that it is flight from a flood of *errors and human inventions*, as already explained. To fly from these, is to “cease from the instruction that causeth to err.” The moment that she shall perceive the waters of this flood, although it were from the mouth of him, who had hitherto poured forth the water of eternal life pure as crystal, she is to prepare for flight, nor is she to linger a moment, looking at his fair countenance, nor the height of his stature, nor his fame, nor any other external attraction, which he may possess. She is to take heed that she go not where the waters of this flood are come, or are *coming*. Instead of being allured by their popularity and their noise; she is to be alarmed by them, and regard them as a coming destruction. If a man will, in this manner, fly from false and unscriptural doctrine and corruptions in worship, and government, he will always escape and be safe. Ah! had Eve thus fled from the waters of the serpent’s mouth, what ruin and misery would have been prevented. Had Israel in the wilderness, fled thus from the first invitations to the sacrifice of Baalpeor, happy would it have been for them and their children. Had the first Christian Church fled from the first approach of this same flood, in the various unfounded opinions and gross heresies that made their appearance from time to time, and still more in the incipient movements of that spirit, which has prompted mortal man to take the name and sit in the seat of God, showing himself that he is God, what confusion and darkness, what wickedness and bloodshed would have been prevented, and the simplicity and beauty of the Apostolic institutions would have come down to us. Or later still; had the Reformed Churches fled from the heresies and innovations, which sprung up among themselves, they might have been this day happy among themselves, the praise of earth, and the terror of all their foes. But what end serves this reasoning? With all this amount of sad experience before them, the men and women of this generation, with mad determination, run in the face of it, charmed by the old serpent, they are by myriads, rushing into his open mouth, and drinking up the waters of death and eternal damnation. “What harm is there in going to hear?” “What evil in hearing a *good sermon*?” they say. And so in spite of all advice, counsel and intreaty, and in defiance of promises and solemn engagements; and in the face of Christ’s authority in the discipline of the Church, they go. O ye deluded men! why will ye not read the harm in our world *lost*? To you officers in the Church, and you people who are striving against *occasional hearing*, as it is termed, and endeavouring to preserve unity and consistency together, it must be great consolation and encouragement to perceive that your course agrees with this flying from the serpent’s flood. How much reproach soever may be cast upon your opposition to the fashionable practice, and how many soever of the carnal, the proud, the hypocritical, the worldly and inconsistent, it may keep out, or drive out of your fellowship, and how much soever it may augment the number of your bitter enemies; yet know certainly, that it is one of the means which God has appointed for the *safety* of the woman. It will therefore never break down any congregation, or destroy any Church. To you who are wavering on this point, and you who have decided to give way to the current practice of hearing any where, what you are pleased to call a good sermon; let this passage be a warning. Instead of flying from the flood, you go to meet it, and so far as your influence goes, you cause the woman to be carried away.

In order to be effectually out of the reach of this flood, the woman must by her wings, leave the earth and mount up heavenward. And there is in this part of the figure, more intended than simply to flee from erroneous doctrine. "She must fly from an earthly mind, earthly attractions, and as far as may be practicable, carnal and earthly company. If she will build her nest in any of these, or even thoughtlessly linger upon them, she will in spite of all the soundness and orthodoxy of her creed, be overtaken by the flood, and by and bye she will become so indifferent and lukewarm as to have no insuperable difficulty in opening *her mouth* with the rest to swallow it. This may be seen exemplified continually in the case of individuals, who, becoming completely absorbed in some worldly business, overlook all the soundness and excellency of their profession, and also their own solemn adherence to it. And if their purposes can be better served, by leaving their own society and falling in with some other, it is done without much hesitation; or if they must be without all religious society together, in order to effect their object, they will finally venture even there. In like manner, when a congregation or an ecclesiastical body seeks to be great and conspicuous in the view of men, on account of her multitude, her men of talents and renown, her wealth, and her weight of influence on the course of politics, she is connecting herself with the earth, and putting herself in a fair way to be carried off by the flood.

Or, when the generality of the members of a Church, have become cold and indifferent in their affections, untender in their walk, careless and negligent about personal religion, and the state of matters between God and their own soul; and the same time are most intent on the attainment of a worldly object, what one soever of those many that are commonly pursued by carnal, ungodly men, it may be, the public profession of such a Church, however pure and scriptural, and her discipline however correct, will not keep her from being carried away. Have not the members of the Associate Church some cause here for serious reflection? Is she not in some danger from this quarter? And if she shall be carried down the stream, (which God forbid,) will not her pure scriptural profession *double* her condemnation? Will she not be a *witness* against herself? Ought not every one then, who has any regard for her public cause left, to be seriously alarmed *in time*?

I am aware that this flight of the woman into the wilderness, has been otherwise interpreted, and in particular, that it has been applied to the retreat of sundry Christians at a very early period after the torrent of Popish corruptions began to set in upon the visible Church, into desert places, and remote and obscure corners of the earth. The retreat of those afterwards called Waldenses, into the vallies of Piedmont, has been particularized. And this may very well be admitted, as a particular and special application of the prophecy. For it has often happened before, and may happen yet again, that removing from one place of this world to another, may for a time be a means to shield the woman from this flood. So, those good and worthy men, who left their native country, and sought shelter in the wilderness of North America, (now the New England States,) found it to be. But this interpretation would be altogether too narrow to admit the whole signification of the woman's flight. I have already shown, that it is a flight from the waters of error, wherever they may make their appearance. And they frequently spring up in the midst of a people, who were once noted for their purity, which the history of these New England Churches but too fully proves. And the case often occurs, in which flight from one place to another, is impracticable, or if it could be accomplished, would not serve the purpose. Yet so long as this flood keeps pouring forth, it must be the duty of the

woman to fly; and there is still given her wings to do so, and therefore, this flying must have a more spiritual and comprehensive meaning in it. It may appear to be a difficulty on the interpretation, because it is said, that "they shall feed her *there* (in her place) 1260 days," from which, it would seem to intimate that her flight was ended before these days began. But this difficulty assumes, that the place of the woman is to be understood, of some particular location on the earth; whereas these words with the help of the history of the woman, enable us to determine certainly, that such a place cannot be understood. For no such place has been yet found, where the woman has securely rested during the 1260 days so far as past. And I hope to show, in illustrating the nature of "*her place*," that her flying thither and her being led there, may well stand together without any incongruity, during the whole period under consideration. And I shall now offer some observations on *her place*, which is the second means of her safety.

(To be continued.)

### ART. III. Church and State, No. 2.

AN article has appeared in Number 9, Volume IX, of the Religious Monitor, the title of which is:—*Reasons for the previous publication of the purpose of Marriage*. It refers to no former article, as the object of attack. Yet many evil and profane tenets are denounced in it, which it is remarkable if any christian has ever uttered or written. "Decrees that it will not exercise the authority, with which the King of nations has invested it. Am I my brother's keeper? To construe that we, who are conscientious, should be compelled to drop it, in order to suit the political notions of a few justices of the peace, or the fastidious delicacy of the young. Lay the authority with which" &c. The want of a signature may for aught I know, be supplied by the peculiarity of style. "To legislate *down altogether*. One evidence more to the *ten thousand* that WERE. To *prostrate* their authority to *mantle up* iniquity." And this phrase, "matter and form," being marked with quotations, may remind the reader of "CHURCH AND STATE." But what if that be an error of the printer, who recollected these words since last September. It cannot be, that the honest zeal of this author, with the pen in his hand to write a defence of publication, would, had he ever read "Church and State," have passed the errors of it, without a particular and pointed exposure, would have adopted a method, which so closely resembles the "clandestine." Yet by commencing conversation without reference to any thing previously spoken, he has conferred on me the privilege of a respondent, and it is my design to exercise it.

The SEVEN PROPOSITIONS, will, upon examination appear to have reference to the following things:—1. The nature of marriage. It is "a civil, a political, and religious contract." 2. The just extent of legislative power. 3. The just extent of executive power. 4. The divine right of the rule of publication, or the right of Church and State to execute it. 5. The same thing, or the duty of people to submit to the rule. 6. The same thing, or the duty of punishing and censuring those who neglect the rule. 7. The duty of censuring magistrates for not enforcing the rule. But this proposition divides itself, as we shall see, into two.

1st. The divine right of publication, which is the same with his 4th, 5th, and 6th, propositions.



2d. The Church's power to legislate a rule, which is not a "correlate" but a *contrary* of his 2d proposition.

We commence with the nature of marriage. And this is one of those subjects, which, as our author justly observes, "will bear a second hearing."

"Marriage" says he "is a divine institution." This is a truth, taking the words in their native import, and detached from what follows. This truth had been explicitly stated in "CHURCH AND STATE." Marriage is divine, with respect to its author, who is God. But had this been all that was intended, this proposition need not have appeared as the leading one of the seven. It is so divine as to be religious. It is indeed said, "I am not speaking of the contract, but of the appointment of the marriage contract." This shows that the author, if he here speaks of the contract, is not aware of it. It also shows, that when he does here speak of the contract, it is the contract proper of which he speaks; it is the subject-matter of the divine appointment. The subject-matter of every divine appointment is unalterable. It consists of all those parts, which are essential to the *being* of the thing. Other things may belong to the *well-being*. But these fall under another distinct appointment. It is the appointment of marriage, of which our author designedly speaks. It is therefore marriage itself, of which he undesignedly speaks. But a contract is made up of obligations. If the obligations, therefore, come under by a couple, do not fill up the measure of the divine appointment, these can never constitute a marriage—nor make the couple, man and wife. And any obligations, which fall without the divine appointment of marriage, do not belong to the marriage contract, and cannot affect its nature. How strange is it then, that he should define the nature of the marriage contract to be sometimes one thing, and sometimes another. That he should define the subject-matter of a divine appointment, as varying with the times, and circumstances, and even with the motives of the parties? "And were I to define the contract," says he, "as it is entered into by the parties, I would be obliged to call it sometimes a civil contract, sometimes a political one, and sometimes a religious one, or chiefly so." Now, for what reasons he would be obliged to call marriage by so many names, he has not told us; nor what it is that constitutes marriage, such a mystery, when entered "as it should be," that it becomes quite nameless. He would have to describe it. "And were I to say what it should be, when entered with a due regard unto its end, supreme and subordinate, I would have to give a description of it." The supreme end of all things is the glory of God. The subordinate end of all things, is either *immediate*, or *remote*. But it is only the *subordinate* and *immediate* end of an institution, that determines its nature. For example, the immediate end of eating and drinking, is to sustain animal life. Wherefore eating and drinking are natural actions, yet the supreme end of those actions is the glory of God. And the subordinate, but remote end of them, when done "as they should be," is, to use our author's language "the good of man in *all* his relations." For to use his reasoning also, God hath said:—*It is good for a man to eat and to drink, and to enjoy the good of his labour.* And that would be "*good for man.*" And again, "it will be allowed, that the covenant of life was a great, a good, a marvelous condescension; but without the institution, [natural but divine] of *eating and drinking*, man could not have enjoyed that good, he could not have entered into that covenant as the federal head of the human family." Therefore eating and drinking are religious institutions, upon his plan of reasoning. But he strengthens his argument thus:—"It is a good of great magnitude to have society in the worship of God, and in all spiritual and religious exercise; and marriage was designed to bring that good

more fully and constantly within the reach of man, than it could have been by the occasional visits of holy angels." All religious society, it seems, besides that of angels, comes within the reach of man by marriage. And if Adam could not have been a federal head without it, society could never have been reached without it. The reason implied in both cases is plain; the human race could not have been propagated without marriage. Substitute propagation, then, the necessary and *immediate* means of all this good, instead of the necessary and *remote* means, marriage, and the features of the argument are unchanged; but presented in a nearer and more distinct point of view. All the good of religious society among men, comes by propagation. If never a man nor woman had to this day, been born into the world, what would this author, and myself, and every other child of Adam, have done for society? We would only have had the occasional visits of holy angels. "It is also a good, though much inferior to the two preceding, to have society in *all* the affairs of this terrestrial life; and for this also marriage was designed." Particularly, may we not add, that by the propagation of the species, mankind, otherwise helpless, might have society in time of war?

But dismissing for a moment, the logic of this argument, let us examine its divinity. The multiplying of the human species, was no less necessary to Christ's federal headship than to Adam's. For it was necessary, both to his incarnation, and the actual existence of the elect seed. To have noticed the second Adam and his covenant, in the above reasoning, so explicitly as the first and his covenant are noticed, would have given the idea a bolder aspect. But it is the same idea, and it is necessarily suggested by the mention of religious society, besides that of angels. Hence, as there never could have been a covenant of works made with Adam, as the federal head of the human family; so there never could have been a covenant of grace made with Christ, as the federal head of an elect seed, without marriage. Thus the institution of marriage, is made antecedent, in its nature and operation, to the institution and operation of both covenants. Moreover, if marriage be in every sense, necessary and essential to the covenant of works, it must in the same sense be necessary and essential to the covenant of grace. That it is a necessary antecedent, will not be designedly plead by many. But if marriage be, as this author and some others appear to infer from Malachi, ii. 15, necessary either as a consequent, or means of the covenant, it is in the former case, a new covenant benefit, and in the other a new covenant ordinance. Eating and drinking will be the same thing; will together with marriage, be religious institutions, or the purchase of Christ. His radical error here, is, that the end, no matter how remote, determines the nature of the means. This principle has often been used to prove, that magistracy includes in its essence, a profession of the true religion, belongs to the covenant of grace, to the mediatorial government of Christ. Let him tell his readers how he will refute these errors, in a consistency with the above principle, implied in these words:—"Neither was it exclusively for the good either of the State, or the Church, on account of which it might have been styled civil, or ecclesiastical."

But to detect this root of error in all its ramifications, observe—

1st. The instituted means of obtaining a certain end, is not, in all cases, naturally and antecedently necessary to that end. Were it even true, that the propagation of mankind is the immediate end of marriage, it would not follow that without marriage, and natural generation, the human family could not have existed, and Adam could not have covenanted with God as their federal representative. If Adam knew his federal character in entering the covenant, it was enough for him. The means were God's. And God had other means than marriage and natural generation,

lying within the immensity of his eternal wisdom and power. Else whence came Eve? Whence the human nature of Christ? These cases, it is true, were miraculous—they were deviations from the common and instituted course of divine operation. But antecedent to the institution of that course, no one of those methods was more miraculous than another. The divine will might have determined that to be natural, which is now miraculous, and that to be miraculous which is now natural. And so far is it from being true, that Adam could not have entered the covenant as a federal head, without the institution of marriage, that the Scriptures plainly teach, he did enter into covenant in that character, without that institution, and without any assurance that marriage ever would be instituted. Gen. xxviii. 17; compare verses 18—24.

2d. Marriage has not the propagation of the race for its *immediate* end, nor is this one end of it of any kind. It is indeed customary for moralists and divines to attribute this to marriage as *one* of its ends, by a kind of euphemy, no other mode of propagation having, in the establishment of God, a moral existence. But ALSTEDTUS gives a definition which is more accurate. "It is instituted by God that the human race might be propagated and preserved, *according to an established rule and order.*" The preservation of this rule and order is one end of marriage. It is not the *seed*, but the *holiness* of the seed, which is made one *remote* end of marriage in that expression of the prophet. Yet it is the holiness only which was common to the old covenant, and the first Adam—the holiness in which man was created. But all this on the supposition only that *Eve* is the *one* person created. To some learned men this appears unnatural, and I may venture to say, it is at least very doubtful. Understand Adam to be the one person created, and all his offspring to be the holy seed (Heb. seed of Elohim) sought by the creation, and the meaning will be thus:—"Did not God create one man Adam, including in him the woman and all mankind, and reserved to himself the Spirit, (Heb. *And the residue of the Spirit was to him*) by which these should each in their appointed time be quickened into life and being? And why create all mankind in one? That this one, being the son of God in moral likeness, and communicating this likeness to all his personal species, all might in this manner be the sons and seed of ELOHIM." See Luke iii. 38. Acts xvii. 26, 29. The subordinate and immediate end of marriage is in the language of the Almighty and Beneficent Creator—a *help-meet* for man. It is, that *man*—each of every human pair, (not *the* man only) might in all *natural* necessities and toils, have an auxiliary corresponding to those necessities. I say *natural*. For help in morality, help in religion, I deny to be one end of marriage. This kind of help may arise from marriage. Yet it is not proper to it, but accidental. And, provided a person's *natural* wants did not interfere, religious help and society may be obtained to better advantage without marriage than with it. 1 Cor. vii. 33, 34.

3d. If propagation were the immediate end of marriage, still the production of society would not be the remote end. It is absurd to assign any thing as the cause of some good to a person, when the absence of that cause, yea, and of that good, supposes the person's non-existence. But this absurdity has been already exposed.

4th. If the remote end of marriage were to produce religious society, still this would not render the covenant of marriage a religious one, although entered "as it should be." It has been shown that not the *remote* but the *immediate* end of an institution can determine its nature.

But what would be the consequence of marriage being, in any part of it, a religious contract? No person, in that case, who is not religious, could, without profaning a thing sacred, presume to get married. Our author, then, if he be a minister, should keep the irreligious back from

marriage, as he would from the Lord's table, till they get religion, or make a profession. If it be here alleged, that marriage being productive, more than any other contracts which obtain among men, of serious temporal changes, and that new natural, moral and civil relations arising out of it, and new religious duties possibly, though not necessarily, resulting from it, it ought to be entered with due consideration, and with a supreme regard to the glory of God;—then I say, where, and by whom, has this been denied? After all, marriage is but a natural and civil institution. It is but a temporal benefit, and is not of the purchase of Christ. It is among the passing and perishing things of this world, which the Spirit teaches us to treat with comparative indifference. 1 Cor. vii. 29—31. It belongs to the children of this world, it belongs to Christians as still partaking with the children of this world, to marry and be given in marriage. Luke xx. 34. "And because Christ plainly affirms marriage to belong to this present world," says the Wirtemberg Confession, "but the administration of the things of this world consists in political laws, constituted according to right and probable reason."

In fine, a religious covenant must have God for a party—at least must have religion for its immediate end. There is but one religious covenant or contract, for present entrance—the covenant of grace. There are but three, or at most but four, divinely authorised methods of formally expressing an accession to the terms of that covenant:—Baptism, the Lord's supper, explicit, formal covenanting, and—which is the same thing with immediate respect only to a certain specific end—the ministerial vow. If marriage be, in any of its parts or obligations, a religious covenant, it must imply in itself a renovation of the covenant of grace—it must be a sacrament. To imagine marriage to be, in any part of it, a religious contract, and yet deny it to be a sacrament—is to grope for a middle ground between Protestants and Papists, which does not exist.

But as the author's divinity is unsound, so his politics are wild. He will have marriage to be sometimes a *political* contract—and that as distinguished from *civil*. Had he termed it either of these alone, it would not have implied any error. The term *political* is often taken in a liberal sense, as synonymous with *civil*, and opposed merely to *ecclesiastical*. But civil and political being distinctively used, the latter must denote something which has *immediate* relation to the state. For the state has a remote, and—as a civil person—even an intimate interest in many contracts which are not political. Contracts which are political must either have the state, *as such*, for a party, or some duty toward the state for its immediate object. Such contracts are framed between the constituent members of a state, "in their primary and conjunct capacity," or more simply, by "WE THE PEOPLE"—These are called Constitutions. Between the people compacted into one state and the officers of the state—These are oaths of office. Between state and state—Such are treaties. What other political contracts there are, and how the matrimonial vow can be one of them, when entered "as it should be"—are questions which I must at present refer to others more learned.\*

"PROP. 2. God has not left it subject to human legislation, in any thing appertaining to the right and orderly constituting of the relation between the parties." Here he ought to have defined what is "necessary to the right and orderly constituting of the relation." By this vague expression, he has reserved to himself a retreat hereafter, by refusing, possibly, any

\* "No ideas or definitions are more distinguishable, than those of civil and political liberty. Political liberty may be defined to be the security with which, from the Constitution, form and nature of the established government, the subjects enjoy civil liberty. Civil liberty is nothing more than the impartial administration of equal and expedient laws."—CHRISTIAN.



construction which common understanding can put upon his words. The sum of his illustrations adds but little additional light to his meaning. It is this: "God himself has legislated on this subject—in other words, he has not left it subject to human legislation. For to suppose any *such* thing left to human wisdom, would be to admit—blasphemy." That the subject matter of a divine appointment is not left subject to be moulded or changed by human wisdom, or by human folly and caprice, I have, in opposition to this author, shown above. Nothing, therefore, which is essential to a marriage, and nothing which is necessary to render the deed of contract—considered in itself, and abstractly from times and circumstances—pleasing to God, is left free to human legislation. But the mode and form of administration, and the penalties for the violation of divine and of human laws on this subject, are matters left free to human legislation. He denies all legislative power both to church and state. For he denies it on things about which God has legislated, and it would be tyrannical for man to legislate on any other. Such things having no moral relation, it would either be idle, or an invasion of men's natural liberties to interfere with them. He refers to Lev. xx. "where God specifies sundry cases, and the punishment to be inflicted by the magistrate." This is one of the proofs that it is blasphemy for man to legislate on this subject. God has done it himself, and fixed by unalterable laws "the penalties to be inflicted by the magistrate." Among the crimes specified in that chapter are those of adultery and witchcraft. He hereby maintains the *judicial law* of Moses to be binding under the new dispensation, and that all adulterers and witches are to be punished with death, and that to hold the contrary is blasphemy. This error, like many others contained in the REASONS, is an exotic plant—it never grew upon Seceder soil. It is likewise most unscriptural. Eph. ii. 15. Heb. x. 28, and xii. 25. But if he disclaim this sentiment, so plainly implied in this proposition and its illustrations, he will then admit that the penalty for those crimes, enacted by God, is abolished. He will admit that these crimes must now pass unpunished, else men must enact new penalties, "which is to admit—blasphemy." Which is his choice?

We have at least one plain example in each Testament of ecclesiastic enactment, in things which either vary according to circumstances, or are indifferent. The amount and time of pecuniary contribution to certain religious purposes in Nehemiah's time, were fixed by "ordinances made for themselves." Neh. x. 32. The use of blood and of things strangled was prohibited in the Synod of Jerusalem, by "decrees to be kept." Acts xv. 29, and xvi. 4. To define circumstances, times and forms, is a power which has been claimed and exercised by all the Reformed churches. The Synod of Dort declare themselves as follows: "Although it be useful and good that church rulers institute and establish among themselves, some set order for the preservation of the body ecclesiastic; yet they ought studiously to beware lest they decline from any thing which Christ, our only Master, has instituted. Wherefore we reject all human inventions, and all laws, which by any person may, about the worship of God, be introduced, so that the consciences of men do in any way become restricted and tied down by them." The church of Scotland, (OLD CONFESSIO) speaks thus: "Not that we judge that the same policy in all things ought to be constituted, and precisely the same order in particular ceremonies for all ages, times and places. For as ceremonies invented by men are only temporary, so they not only may be, but ought to be changed, when they are found rather to favor and promote superstition, than to edify the church of God." In perfect accord with both the above, is the language of the AUGSBURGH CONFESSIO "The apostles decreed to abstain from blood. Who now observes it? Nor

yet do they commit sin who do not observe it. Since not even the apostles themselves were willing to burden the *conscience* with such a servitude, but only for a time prohibited it, to avoid offence. For the *perpetual will of the Gospel* is to be considered in regard to the decree. Scarcely any canons are kept accurately, and many are daily becoming obsolete among those who, with the greatest diligence, circulate traditions. Nor are men's consciences safe, unless this rule of equity be observed—that we know those canons to be kept, not from any opinion of their necessity—and that conscience will not be wounded, although the traditions become obsolete.” From this uniform sentiment of the Reformed churches have arisen, the many rules in Books of Discipline, Books of Policy, Forms of Process, and Directories for Worship; the subject matter of which is indifferent; which often may be and ought to be changed; which never were intended to be observed as *divine rules*, from any opinion of their necessity, that the consciences of men might be restricted and tied down by them; which are daily becoming obsolete, in defiance of the greatest diligence to circulate them; which are often permitted to expire peaceably, among the strictest Seceders, by general consent, or extreme old age. Let any man read the First and Second Books of Discipline of the church of Scotland, the authority of which is acknowledged by an express act of Synod not to be superseded or repealed to this day; let him read the DIRECTORY candidly, and believe the W. M. ASSEMBLY mean what they say, and then let him affirm, if he decently can, that he, or his minister, *attempts* to observe the one half of those rules, in letter or spirit. But upon our author's principle, all those rules and canons are legislated, not by man, but by God; else the churches were guilty of blasphemy in enacting them. And here the hidden design of this ambiguous proposition may be discovered. He saw the absurdity of saying in so many words, “that Synod could make a divine rule.” But to avoid this, he alleges that so many of the rules in the Directory and new Book of Discipline, as “we whose consciences” choose to have a fancy for, are not made. They all existed prior to these enactments; neither may be nor ought to be changed; ought to be kept from an opinion of their necessity; ought to restrict and tie down consciences of men; stand upon an equal footing with any precept of the moral law; and, although they be nought but canons and traditions of the church, “matter and form” of which are indifferent, yet they shall bind the civil administration. But how he can, consistently with himself, call it blasphemy to legislate on subjects on which God has legislated, and yet maintain, as we shall see afterwards, that a rule which is “matter and form” of it, indifferent in itself, the church ought to enforce on all persons and in all cases, is a difficulty which he is still under obligations to the public to explain.

Two inferences are appended to this proposition, which merit notice only by their *truism*. They both amount to one thing: the Supreme Being is supreme—both in Church and State.

(To be Continued.)

---

**ART. IV. *An Examination of Christ's Words to Peter.***

Matth. xxi. 18, 19. "And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

IN this passage we have what may be called the main plea of the Roman Catholics. Here it is supposed that Peter and his successors are invested with that authority, which is the vital principle and great foundation of their religion. Take away their explanation of this text, and the whole superstructure reared and resting upon it for ages, falls to the ground. In these words of our Saviour, it is supposed that Peter is set forth as the Rock on which the church is built, and that the keys are given to him as an emblem of his authority to decide in all controversies, to decree and reverse his decrees, to admit and exclude in the church below, and in the kingdom of glory. It is therefore of the utmost consequence, in judging of the claims of the Roman Catholic church, to be acquainted with the true meaning of these verses. And no one can examine them with any degree of intelligence and candor without being convinced that however weighty and permanent the truth which they teach, they are but as a foundation of sand to that house of idolatry, tyranny and blood which has been erected upon them.

In order that any thing may be made of these words in favor of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, it will be necessary to show, in the first place, that Christ here gives to Peter a peculiar and superior authority over the other apostles, and the whole church, though in other places we find the apostles, and the prophets and apostles together, called the foundation on which the church is built; and the same power of binding and loosing is given to all the apostles which is here given to Peter. Eph. ii. 20. Rev. xxi. 14. Matth. xviii. 18. It will be necessary, in the second place, to show that Christ gave up his own place in the church to his supposed successor or vicar; in other words, that he ceases to be the Rock and Foundation of his church, and hath parted with the power of loosing and binding; for the principal ceases to act in his own person when he appoints one to act as his substitute or vicar. It will be necessary to prove, in the third place, that the words of Christ teach that Peter was to have an uninterrupted line of successors, possessing the same authority over the church, though the passage contains not the least hint of this, and the inference is as destitute of all reason as if it were said, because Luther was the first of Reformers in Germany, Calvin in Geneva and Farrel in France, therefore they must have a perpetual line of successors, and there must be primates in these different countries. A fourth thing to be proved is, that this line of succession is to be found in the Roman church till the time of its division, and then that it ceased in the Greek, and remained in the Latin church, about which things this text and the whole Scriptures are as silent as the grave. It must also be proved that the chair of Peter was fixed at Rome, never to be moved from that place; though of this also the Scriptures are entirely silent, and though his holiness has not always been able to keep his seat in "the eternal city." (Quere. How long might the succession be interrupted by death, and delays in election, and how long might the chair be removed by pestilence, or war, or the imprisonment of the Pope, before the charm of succession and of place would be lost?) Last of all we must have proof that the Pope of Rome is pointed at by these words, or by some evident marks as the sole representative of Peter in all ages. The power, the nature and extent of it, the succession, the place, the person, are all vitally important in this matter. And to the difficulties attending all these things, the verses in Matthew are no more than a straw to remove so many mountains.

In the words referred to, Christ says to the Apostle, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Two different views are entertained respecting what is meant by "this rock"—some supposing it to be Peter, and others his confession that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God." On this, as on many other subjects, the Fathers take opposite sides. Some suppose the confession of Peter to be intended, it not being then understood how important a different explanation would be found for supporting the pretensions of the Pope. Among these are Theophylact and Chrysostom. On the other hand, Cyprian, Jerome and Tertullian understand the Rock to mean Peter. However, Erasmus, who, though a Catholic, was of a different mind, makes an apology for the two former, and quotes the words of Augustine to prove that they considered Peter as called this Rock only as a type of Christ. Yet if we suppose that Peter is here called a Rock, what more is said of him than of all believers,—they are all lively stones in the building of mercy, and the church is also said to be built on the other apostles and on the prophets, as well as on Peter. It is evident that in respect to all saving benefits the church is built on Christ alone, for "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus." But besides the rock on which a house is built, the first materials laid upon it are called the foundation. In this respect the apostles were eminently, and all the primitive Christians were in a more general sense, the foundation first laid on Christ, on which succeeding churches were built. Paul speaks of the churches begun by the ministry of others as foundations on which he chose not to build; and again, "nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure," which means the church which God was beginning to build. Peter himself, in his first Epistle, (chap. ii. 4, 5 &c.) is very far from making himself a vicar-stone, or foundation, substituted for Christ. He invites all to come to Christ himself, the living stone, and speaks of all believers as with himself lively stones in this building. The coincidence between the name of Peter, which signifies a rock, and the words which follow, is the chief reason for referring what is said to him. In opposition to this it hath been noticed that the words are not precisely the same. The Greek *Petros* is only the derivative of *Petra*, and even if our Lord used the Syriac language, the manner of speech would lead us to suppose a similar variation; for he says not, thou art Peter, or a Rock, and upon thee, or upon this, will I build my church, but by repeating the word *Rock* together with the relative, he intimates a difference. And for this variation of the word there was no necessity, if in both cases it referred to the same person, for *Petros* signifies a rock as well as *Petra*, and the change would seem unnatural if both words referred to the Apostle. Most interpreters have therefore understood what is said as applying to the confession of Peter, or rather to Christ himself, the subject of his confession, and in the most proper sense of the term, the only Rock and Foundation of his church.

The words of Peter in owning Jesus to be "The Christ, the Son of the living God," may be regarded as referring to the words of the Prophet (Isa. xxviii. 16,) where Christ is called the foundation laid in Zion, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation, or as Peter calls it in his citation of these words, a *living* stone.\* And the words of Christ's answer may be regarded as referring to the same prophecy, as if he had said, "Thou hast owned me to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, and so that living stone and sure foundation on which the church is to be built, and in this confession thou hast shown thyself

\* *Wolfii curæ.*



worthy of thy name. Thou art Peter, a rock, a living stone in the building of mercy. Farther, I assure you that according to the predictions to which you have referred, upon that rock which you have confessed, I will lay many other stones like yourself, and thus build my church—and being built on such a rock, it will be a *sure foundation*, the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” The chief objection against this view of the passage is, the distance between the reference and the thing referred to. But in many instances references are to be determined, not by the juxta-position of words, but the evident relation of things. An example of this will be found as strange, as what must be supposed here, in John vi. 48, 49, 50, where Christ speaking in the 50th verse, of the bread that cometh down from heaven, refers not to the manna spoken of in the verse immediately preceding, but to the true bread spoken of in verse 48th. The general language of the Scriptures would also lead us naturally to this view of the words; Christ is so often spoken of as the rock, the corner stone, and the foundation of the church, to the exclusion of every other. If Peter be made the vicar of Christ, and the foundation of the church, to whom we are to come to be determined as to what we are to believe and do;—if we are to come to him for the pardon of our sins, and if it be through him that we have entrance into the everlasting kingdom of God, this is not to lay another foundation beside Christ, but another foundation instead of him.

The gates of hell or *hades* never denote either the powers or punishments of hell, but the state of the dead; and the promise that the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against the church or her foundation, (for either or both may be understood,) is, in plain language, a promise of the resurrection. The permanency or security of the church in the world are not the things intended, but the certainty that death should not have the dominion over Christ or his members, and this is inferred from the character of the Rock on which the church is built, which very clearly leads us to suppose this Rock to be Christ, and not any mortal man. It is because, He is the Son of the living God, that death could not have dominion over him, and it is because the church is built on him, that she also shall be raised up: “Because he lives we shall live also; in Christ shall all be made alive.” There is something exceedingly unreasonable as well as profane in predicating the resurrection of believers on their being built upon a mere man who cannot secure himself from the gates of death, nor deliver his own soul from the grave; who cannot secure himself from being defeated, driven from his throne, imprisoned and cut off by worms of the dust. How vain to trust, that such an one can save us from the hand of death, that he can in any sense, which may be put upon the words, keep the gates of hell from prevailing against us!\* Peter had confessed Christ to be the Son of the living God, but in a little time his

\* Since writing the above, the following anecdote has been related to me by an aged emigrant from Ireland. As it has some reference to one well known and much esteemed in our country, and illustrates the absurdity of men with no more than ordinary power over things seen, claiming such extravagant powers over the things not seen, I could not resist the temptation to repeat it.

An Irish Papist being apparently near death, among other dispositions of his property, left five guineas in the hands of his sister for the priest, as a remuneration for praying his soul out of purgatory. The sister, who appears to have had some portion of the native shrewdness of her country, informed the priest of what her brother had done, and promised to give him double the sum if he would keep her brother from dying. This however he told her was not in his power. “What!” says she, “can you pray the soul out of purgatory, and yet not keep it in the body? If you cannot keep it where it is, how can you deliver it from the place where it is going?” She kept the money in her hands and returned to her brother. The venerable Doctor Clark, well known for his eccentricity and piety, being at that time in Ireland, and in the neighborhood of the sick man, subsequently called to see him; and with the divine blessing was the means of preserving his life from the grave, and of delivering the souls of both brother and sister from the horrible popish superstitions under which they had labored.

faith would meet with a severe trial. He would see this Son of the living God expiring upon the cross, and the expectation of the church expiring with him. Christ therefore arms him beforehand for this trial, by assuring him that he would not be conquered by death, but would destroy him; that he would burst a-under the gates of *hades*, and thus make a way for his people, and give them a pledge of their own victory over this enemy.

It still remains to be considered what Christ intends by the keys which he promises to Peter. The Church of Rome considers these as implying the supreme power of Peter and his successors; a power not limited to the present world, but extending to the glorious habitation of Jehovah. As if it had been a very small thing to usurp the dominion belonging to Christ upon the earth, the Pope has unblushingly claimed the key of the Kingdom of Glory; so that he can hardly be said to allow God to exercise authority over any part of his dominion. The very habitation of the Most High must be shut up, and none must enter there, but by the Pope's permission. The throne of the Eternal must be besieged, and none have access to His presence, but as the Pope is pleased to use his key. He must stand at the gate of heaven to open, and none can shut; to shut, and none can open. He must have the sole power to bind and to loose whomsoever he will. Such are the arrogant pretensions of this feeble mortal. But let us look a little into these words to ascertain the validity of his claims, before we surrender our lives and liberty, our faith, hope and eternal inheritance into his hands.

Some interpreters have supposed the keys to be emblems of authority, being led to this by a mistaken view of Isa. xxii. 22, where we are told that the key of the house of David was to be laid on the shoulder of Eliakim. In the preceding verse we are told that the government would be committed into his hand, but there is no more reason to consider the key as an emblem of this government, than the robe and girdle of which mention is also made. The truth is, that keys might be emblems of certain privileges or appendages of royalty, but neither their nature or use would render them suitable emblems of royalty itself; and nothing is known of their being such in fact in any age or nation of the world. The use of them in the passage referred to is mentioned, and it is one which would be as competent to the steward or servant as the king:—"So he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open."

In order to understand the true import of these words, it will be necessary to go back and review a little the history of the church. Before the calling of Abraham, no distinction was made between nations as to the privileges of God's covenant, and so none as to religious rites. But when God began to set apart one nation to be his peculiar people, he began to set up marks of distinction between them and others; and the chief of those rites by which they were distinguished, were circumcision and the use of meats.\* They had many other ordinances peculiar to them as a nation, but by these they could most readily be known, and kept separate in their intercourse with the world. The great sources of intercourse, and those by which national distinctions are most readily lost, are trade and marriage. By those two rules, corresponding to these means of intercourse, God therefore guarded against the mingling of the Israelites with the rest of men, and the consequent loss of their distinction as the seed of Jacob. And though this distinction began in circumcision, the use of meats was that which was most constant, public and peculiar. Circumcision being given to Abraham, Ishmael and all the other branches

\* Lightfoot.

of his family retained this rite as well as the children of Israel. But when Jacob received the name of Israel, as the father of a spiritual seed, the distinction as to meats began, in their not using thenceforward the hollow of the thigh. And this distinguished them not only from all who were uncircumcised, but from all the other branches of Abraham's family. There had been, before this time, a difference made between beasts which were clean and unclean, with a reference to sacrifice, but no restriction from the use of any meat, which was wholesome for food. Now however a distinction of a different kind began, and was greatly enlarged at the giving of the law. And these rites formed a wall between Israel and all other nations, which they themselves expected to be removed when Messias should come. Thus the kingdom of God was shut up among them, and the door firmly closed against the admission of any one, unless by his becoming outwardly as well as inwardly a Jew. Let us next compare with these things what is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, especially in the second, tenth and fifteenth chapters, and it may help us to understand what is meant by the giving of the keys to Peter. There was not a single key, but keys given to him; and whether we understand these as referring to the keys of knowledge,\* and of admission into the church, or to the different classes of men, the Jews and Gentiles, to whom the door of admission was opened, we will find the history in the Acts illustrating as a comment these words of our Lord. The Scribes and Pharisees had taken away the key of knowledge by their subversion of the true Gospel, and Peter was honored to open this door, which they had closed, by directing men to the righteousness and grace of Jesus Christ, and preaching the promise as free to all the hearers of the word. He stood forth first of all to proclaim the Saviour risen, and to preach forgiveness of sins to all men in his name. He also proclaimed these things first to the Jews, and opened the door for their admission by baptism into the church of the Redeemer, under the new and better dispensation. Though the other apostles stood forth with him, and all spake to the people, he had the precedence in this work. He spake to the men of Judea and those who dwelt at Jerusalem, and he proposed their admission into the church. Then again, he was honored to open the door to the Gentiles, of which we have an account in the calling of Cornelius. Gentiles who were proselytes to the Jews' religion had been admitted before this time. But Cornelius, though a convert, was not a proselyte; so that he was the first Gentile admitted as such into the church—that is, without circumcision and restriction as to meats. The like of this had not happened from the days of Jacob to this time. It was with great difficulty, and only by an extraordinary vision that Peter could be prevailed on by the admission of this man to put his hand to that venerable fabric of rites, which had stood for so many ages, but was soon to be demolished. This act also caused great offence to those of the circumcision, and the substance of their complaint against Peter was this, "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." Acts xi. 3. They join these two distinctions of circumcision and of meats together, and complain that he had disregarded both. The authority which Peter received for opening the door to the Gentiles, was by a vision of meats of all kinds, which he was commanded not to call common or unclean; God thus signifying that he had abolished the distinction of meats, and so of Jews and Gentiles. This apostle also intimates his particular designation to this work in his address to the other apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Acts xv. 7. And it is evident that he refers to his designation by Christ, at the time when he promised him the keys,

\* The admission of men to be teachers among the Jews was signified by giving them a key. Camero in loco.

rather than to the authority conferred by the vision, which was a recent event. "Brethren," says he, "ye know that a good while ago (*ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*, a long time ago, or from ancient days,) God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." Now this privilege was given to Peter only. He only had the keys to open the door. The others, however, followed his example by admitting the Gentiles through the door which he had opened; and they had, in common with him, the power of binding and loosing—that is, of declaring *things* lawful or unlawful. These words have no respect to persons. It is not *whomsoever*, but *whatsoever* ye bind, &c. Lightfoot,\* whose views are partly followed in the preceding remarks, quotes a vast number of sayings of the Jews, to show how commonly they expressed the declaring of things lawful or unlawful by binding and loosing; and he very properly adds, that we are not to suppose that our Saviour would use so common an expression with a meaning entirely different from that, in which it would be universally understood by the people. The history of what was actually done by the apostles may also serve as a comment on these words. For they did actually declare what things contained in the former dispensation were lawful, and what were unlawful. They bound the churches from circumcision, the passover, sacrifices, purifications, observing days, and all those things which have been abolished by the coming of Christ, and they loosed them from the restrictions of the law as to meats, association with the Gentiles, the place of worship, and all those things wherein our liberty has been enlarged.

Something remarkable has also been noticed respecting the time when the door of the kingdom was opened to the Gentiles. At this very time the Gentile idolatry had reached its height, and shown the most horrible of its fruits in the first of the nations. Caius Caligula was emperor of Rome, than whom a greater monster of wickedness never appeared in human shape, unless perhaps we should except some who have sat upon the same throne, "giving a thousand times more evidence of being the successors of Caius than of Peter." The cruelty of this tyrant may be sufficiently understood from his well known wish, that Rome had but one neck so, that by a single blow he might sever it from the body. His feasts, his amusements were all tasteless, unless mingled with the blood of his subjects. Such was his senseless and daring impiety, that like his modern successor, he affected to be a god, and would have his image set up and worshipped in all parts of his dominions. It was at such a time when the wisdom of man was showing the utmost that could be expected from it, in that nation which has been the favorite boast of infidelity, that it pleased God by Peter to open the door of his kingdom to the Gentiles, and by the foolishness of preaching to save those who believed.

If the preceding views of our Saviour's words be correct, no one can be at a loss to see how slight ground the church of Rome has for her lofty pretensions. If any thing further were necessary, we might appeal to the history of Peter, in which we will find nothing corresponding to the authority supposed to be conferred upon him. What was the treatment which this apostle received after Christ had called him the Rock, and promised him the keys? Did the other apostles fall down before him? Did they kiss his feet, or hold his stirrup, while there lacked kings to do this service? Did they salute him as their father, or call him "their Lord God, the Pope?" Did they henceforth refer to him all matters for his infallible decision? It seems very unfortunate to these pretensions, that the next name which Peter receives after being called a Rock,

\* *Horæ Hebraicæ.*



was that of Satan; and it was for a strange specimen of his infallibility, nothing less than rebuking Christ, opposing his will, and taking offence at his cross. (See verses 21—23.) And where was the infallibility of this first supreme pontiff, when he was in the hall of judgment, saying of Christ, I know him not, and when he cursed and swore? Where was his infallibility when he dissembled and walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel? Where his supreme power when Paul withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed? And where the safety of walking according to him as an unerring rule, when the Jews and even Barnabas were carried away with his dissimulation? (Gal. ii. 11—13.) What had become of him as the foundation of the church, when the church was blamed equally for saying "We are of Paul, we are of Apollos, and we are of Cephas or Peter," instead of all saying, we are of Christ? (1 Cor. i. 12.) How comes it to pass that the other apostles took upon them to choose and set apart a successor to Judas, instead of referring the choice and ordination to their supposed Pope? And how is it that they debated questions, decided them, wrote epistles, travelled, planted churches, and did all things without a single reference to the authority of Peter, and without the slightest hint of his employing the least authority over them? This indeed Christ had strictly forbidden. His disciples were to call no man master upon earth, and they were not to be as the kings of the earth.

And even if we were to admit all that is urged in favor of the primacy of Peter, how shall we account for the total silence of the Scriptures in relation to his successor, and the place where he is to be found? It is never so much as said that Peter was the bishop of Rome; that he fixed his chair in that city, or that he visited it. If we are to be ruled by the successor of Peter at Rome, under the pain of eternal damnation, this must indeed be a vital point in our religion; and it is no more necessary that we should be told that Christ came into our world, and died for our sins, than that Peter came to Rome and fixed there his seat, as supreme head of the church. And yet no diligence has ever detected the least hint of these things in the Bible. Even the story founded on the statement of Eusebius, that Peter came to Rome in the second year of Claudius, and was bishop there twenty-five years, is attended with such insuperable difficulties, that the Catholics can make nothing of it but by denying one half as a manifest falsehood, and making a history according to their own taste out of the remainder. And surely where they deny so much of the evidence, it would be hard to require others to believe the truth of other parts at the peril of their eternal salvation. Paul was the minister of the uncircumcision, as Peter was of the circumcision. Was it probable then that Peter would leave his own and enter into the field assigned to Paul? Was it probable that he would become the bishop of the uncircumcised Romans, rather than of the Jews at Jerusalem, Babylon, Egypt, or some other place where they abounded? If Peter were so long at Rome, and while Paul must have been there also, how is it that in the many epistles written from that city by Paul, he never once mentions Peter as uniting with him either in sentiments or salutations? And how is it that in his epistle to the Romans we find the same singular omission? It has been properly asked, was Peter asleep, or was he sullen, or what is the reason that his name never appears? In a word, there is the clearest evidence that the church built on this pretended power of Peter, and the perpetuation of it in the Pope, is founded on the sand, and when the rain shall descend, the floods come, and the wind blow, and beat upon this house, it shall fall, and great shall be the fall of it. Babylon shall sink as a mill-stone into the sea, and shall be found no more at all.

DIORTHOTES.

**ART. V. *Plenary Indulgence in the Form of a Jubilee proclaimed to the Roman Catholic Clergy and Faithful of the Diocese of Philadelphia, May 1, 1833.***

We publish this curious document to satisfy uninformed and incredulous Protestants that one of the principal abominations which caused our fathers to separate from the Roman church still exists in that community; and lest it might be supposed that we had injured the performance by suppressing parts we publish it *entire*.

That our readers may understand the nature of this proclamation, they must bear in mind that Romanists maintain that even after the guilt of sin which subjects to eternal punishment is removed, there often remains a debt of temporal punishment to be suffered; that "if this debt be not paid by penitential sufferings, or *graciously remitted by indulgences* in this life, it will, after death, retard the entrance of the soul into heaven until the last farthing be paid in the prison of purgatory."

They also maintain, that there is a "sacred treasure composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of the Virgin Mother, and of all the saints;" that the Pope has "authority from heaven to unlock that sacred treasure," and to dispense to the faithful. From this treasure, thus opened, indulgences are issued, which, in the days of Luther, and according to the account given in his writings, were declared by Roman priests to have an efficacy so great, that the most heinous sins would be remitted and expiated by them, and the person be freed both from punishment and guilt." It is now pretended that they only remit the canonical penance imposed by the church, liberate from the debt of temporal punishment which may remain due after the guilt has been remitted by the sacrament of penance, and open the doors of purgatory to those suffering spirits who departed without having made full satisfaction for their iniquities by fruits worthy of penance.

Of indulgences, some are called *plenary*, because when obtained, they remit the whole debt of temporal punishment which remained due; others are for a certain number of days or years, and only remit so much of the debt as would have been discharged by the performance of so many years or days of canonical penance. Without further preliminary remarks, we insert the Philadelphia proclamation.

**FRANCIS PATRICK**, by the grace of God, and appointment of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Arath, and Coadjutor of the Bishop of Philadelphia—To the Clergy and Faithful of the Diocese of Philadelphia: Grace, mercy and peace from God the Father, and from Christ Jesus our Lord.

*Venerable Brethren and beloved Children in Christ*.—It becomes our duty to communicate to you the plenary Indulgence, in the form of a Jubilee, which his present Holiness, Gregory XVI. has graciously proclaimed to the Christian world. The objects which he has in view in dispensing the treasures of the church with such great liberality on the present occasion, will best be understood from his own words.

"After we had taken solemn possession of the Pontificate in the Basilic of Lateran, we fully communicated to our venerable brethren the Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops, our sentiments on the evils which afflict the church; in order to excite their faith and piety, and to conjure them to "*place themselves as walls for the house of Israel*," by directing all their efforts, prayers and counsels, to defeat the machinations, which, with sorrow, we behold formed against it. For that purpose we admonished them to raise their eyes and hands to the mountains, whence we feel confident that help will come, as we well know that tranquility will ensue, when He is appeased, "*who commands the wind and the sea*," and that divine mercy will descend upon us after humble prayer has ascended to God.

"But since the tempest still rages, and the conspiracy of the wicked every where prevails, we have determined on directing general supplications to be made throughout the whole church; and we therefore unlock the treasures of heavenly gifts, that the souls of the faithful may be excited to piety, and being thoroughly cleansed from the defilement of sin, their prayers may become more grateful to God, and ascend before Him as an odour of sweetness. It was indeed customary with our predecessors in accordance with the ancient practice of the Roman Church, to seek aid from the united prayers of the faithful, not only at the commencement of their Pontificate, but also whenever the Lord was pleased to afflict his people. To invite all to penance the sacred treasure of Indulgences was brought forth, that sinners sincerely detesting and humbly confessing their iniquities, might approach with confidence to the throne of grace, to God who

is prone to forgive, and who does not in wrath withhold his mercies. With this view, after having recommended our design in earnest and fervent prayer to the Father of mercies, we likewise proclaim to the whole Catholic world, an indulgence in the form of a general Jubilee; and we cherish the devout hope, that the author of all consolation will shorten the days of our tribulation, calm the present agitation, give lasting peace to the church, and every where restore security to public order."

Such, beloved brethren, are the holy ends which the Vicegerent of our Lord Jesus Christ proposes to himself and to all the church in this solemn act of authority. The pious works which he prescribes are those which the holy Scriptures in so many places point out as highly acceptable before God, namely, prayer, fasting, and alms-deeds, besides the reception of the sacraments of penance, and the eucharist. Having regard to many of the impediments under which many of the faithful labor, his Holiness has, by a special rescript, empowered the respective prelates to dispense in the performance of some of the works so prescribed, and to prolong the time for gaining the Indulgence. We, therefore, availing ourselves of the faculties thus delegated to us by the Apostolic See, declare, that the faithful of this Diocese may, at any time within six months from the date hereof, gain the spiritual favors thus proffered by the chief pastor of the church, on complying with the terms and conditions subjoined to this our pastoral letter.

Though no one is obliged under pain of sin to perform the works of piety prescribed for gaining the indulgence, (as it is a spiritual favor granted to us, and not an obligation imposed on us,) yet none, we trust, will prove so indifferent to their eternal interests, as wantonly to forego this opportunity of enriching themselves with the heavenly treasure. The debts to divine justice wherewith we stand charged for our many offences, but so imperfectly deplored and expiated, may now be cancelled by the plentiful redemption of Christ, which the Indulgence applies to penitent sinners—the obstacles which would retard our entrance into the kingdom of heaven, may be removed by virtue of the power of the keys, specially given to the prince of the Apostles. Whilst we can thus experience the tenderness of the mercy of God, shall we choose rather to await the rigors of his justice, and expose ourselves to be cast into that prison whence we shall not be liberated, until, by penal endurance, we have paid the last farthing? Shall even one among us, by continuing in sin, provoke his everlasting vengeance? Thinkest thou this, O man! that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and patience, and long suffering? Knowest thou not that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance? Be converted, then, brethren, and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be your ruin. God, appeased by your humiliation, "will send his fury in no more, because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again and have mercy on us: he will put away our iniquities: and he will cast all our sins into the bottom of the sea."

Given at Philadelphia this first day of May, in the year of our Lord MDCCCXXXIII.

FRANCIS PATRICK.

Bp. Arath, and Coadj. Phila.

JOHN HUGHES, Sec'y.

#### *Conditions for gaining the Jubilee Indulgence.*

1st. Persons desirous of gaining the Jubilee, are to visit three churches, or twice one church, within the space of three weeks, and there devoutly pray for the general interests of the church. Persons unable to make these visits should pray in private at least twice for the same ends.

2dly They are to fast on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, in one of the three weeks, or (by dispensation,) upon one of these days in each week.

Persons unable to fast should, in lieu thereof, recite the litany of the saints, or a third part of the rosary, or other pious work, at the discretion of the Pastor or Confessor.

3dly. They are to confess their sins within the same weeks, and to receive reverently the most holy sacrament of the eucharist.

Children not yet admitted to their first communion, may gain the Indulgence by making their confession, and performing any pious work which their Confessor or Pastor may prescribe, without complying with any other condition.

4th. They are to give some alms to the poor, as the devotion of each one shall suggest. The objects of these alms are entirely left to their own choice.

**JUBILEE EXERCISES.**—The exercises of the Jubilee in the city will commence on Sunday the 6th October. Each Pastor out of the city will appoint a time for his own congregation within the six months. During the time so selected the Litanies will be recited after Mass each morning; and such instructions given as the Pastor shall deem suitable.

**REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.**—Our readers will notice the ends to be gained by these indulgences. The treasure is unlocked, that the souls of the faithful may be excited to piety; and that they, being "thoroughly cleansed from the defilement of sin," might present prayers more grateful to God. That the faithful may "enrich themselves with heavenly treasures." That their debts to divine justice, imperfectly deplored and expiated, may be cancelled. That "obstacles which would retard our entrance into the kingdom of heaven may be removed." That there may be an "experience of the tenderness of the mercy of God," and an escape from "the rigor of his justice." That we may avoid continuing in sin, by which we provoke God's everlasting vengeance, and "expose

ourselves to that prison, whence we shall not be liberated until, by penal endurance, we have paid the last farthing."

Let the reader next notice the author of such favors, and the source from which they come. They are not from the God of mercies, nor from the fountain of his love and grace; but from the present Pope, and from his *grace* and *great liberality*!—"which his present Holiness, Gregory XVI. has *graciously* proclaimed"—"dispensing the treasures of the church with such *great liberality*!" If this is not ascribing the glory of grace and liberality, in dispensing spiritual favors, to a vile worm of the earth, and giving encouragement to the grossest idolatry, we altogether mistake the meaning of the terms.

There is indeed something said about "sinners sincerely detesting and humbly confessing their iniquities." But we are not informed whether the repentance here intended is contrition or attrition. If the latter only, then, according to the distinction made by Romanists, the faithful are only called to that sorrow which arises from the fear of punishment; and and if indulgences only remit temporal punishment, no higher kind of sorrow is herein requisite. Every Protestant knows what value to put upon such a repentance.

We would call attention to the conditions upon which indulgences can be obtained. Even the hardest terms are very easy. But easy as they are, they can be rendered easier still by dispensation. What an invention to lead souls away from the only fountain which God has opened for sin and uncleanness! What encouragement to the poor Roman devotee to continue during intervals indulging in sin, trusting that at Lent, or Christmas, or the Assumption of the Virgin, or a Jubilee, he can obtain a plenary indulgence!

We, at present, invite attention only to one thing more in this proclamation. It is asserted that no one is obliged under pain of sin to perform the works of piety prescribed for gaining the indulgence, (as it is a spiritual favor granted to us, and not an obligation imposed upon us.) Joining this assertion to the words in this proclamation which specify the ends to be obtained by obtaining indulgence, we have declarations which will sound strange in Protestants' ears. "No one is obliged under pain of sin" to embrace an opportunity "to become thoroughly cleansed from the defilement of sin." "No one is obliged under pain of sin"—"to enrich himself with heavenly treasures." "No one is obliged under penalty of sin"—to have his "debts to divine justice cancelled"—"obstacles which retard our entrance into the kingdom of heaven removed"—to embrace an opportunity "to experience the tenderness of the mercy of God"—"to escape the rigors of his justice." "No one is obliged under pain of sin"—to avoid "continuing in sin." "No one is obliged under pain of sin"—to cease "to provoke God's everlasting vengeance!!" Can those who maintain such dreadful doctrines be ministers of Jesus Christ? Can any one who has ever read the Bible submit his soul to the direction of such blind guides? Well may every Christian, with a soul-aborrence at such infidel sentiments exclaim, O my soul! come not thou unto their secrets; mine honor be not united with their assembly!

Our prayer unto God is, that the thousands of our fellow-beings who are involved in such deep and fatal darkness of popery as to submit to such impositions, may be enlightened by the Spirit of truth, and saved from eternal destruction.—*Reformation Advocate*.

---



## ART. VI. General Assembly.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met, agreeably to appointment, in the Seventh Presbyterian Church, in the city of Philadelphia, Thursday, May 16th, 1833, at 11 o'clock A. M., and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. James Hodge, D. D., the Moderator of the last Assembly, from Eph. v. 25—27. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

The Rev. Dr. William A. M'Dowell was *unanimously* elected Moderator, and the Rev. Sylvester Eaton was elected Temporary Clerk. Adjourned to meet to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock. Concluded with prayer.

*Friday Morning, May 17th, 9 o'clock.* The Assembly met and was opened with prayer.

*Resolved*, That as a standing rule of the General Assembly, a committee of five be appointed to consider all applications for leave of absence, with power to decide on the same, &c. Dr. M'Carter, Mr. Lyons, Mr. Plumer, Mr. Gray, and Mr. Squier, were therefore appointed.

*Committee of Overtures.*—Dr. Hodge, Dr. Chapman, Mr. E. W. Crane, Mr. Nevins, Mr. Kant, Mr. William Brown, Mr. Haines, Mr. Steele and Mr. Andrews.

*Judicial Committee.*—Dr. Beman, Mr. Joseph Campbell, Mr. Latta, Mr. Jessup, Mr. Boyd, and Dr. H. Campbell.

Dr. Miller then moved that a committee of three be appointed to prepare a draught of a letter to the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, with a view of commencing a correspondence with that body.

Dr. Green, Dr. Beman, Dr. Lawrie and Mr. Boyd, were appointed a committee to correspond with the United Secession Churches of Scotland.

The Permanent Clerk reported that there had been put into his hands the following items of judicial business, viz: "A complaint of the 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia against the Synod of Philadelphia." "A complaint of the Rev. E. W. Gilbert against the Synod of Philadelphia." "A remonstrance of the Synod of Philadelphia." "Complaint of the Rev. Messrs. R. Catchcart, G. Duffield, and E. W. Gilbert against the Synod of Philadelphia." "Complaint of John Cochran against the 8th Presbyterian church in Philadelphia." "An appeal by the Rev. Dr. James Snodgrass from a decision of the Synod of Pittsburg." "Resolutions and complaint of West Lexington Presbytery, and also an answer to the dissent and complaint of Messrs. Campbell, Taylor and others." "Complaint of Samuel Lowrie, against the Synod of Cincinnati." And "A memorial from the Presbytery of Indianapolis." The above papers were put into the hands of the judicial committee.

Overture No. 3, viz: A question from the Presbytery of Bethel, respecting holding communion with the followers of William C. Davis, a deposed minister, and calling themselves Independent Presbyterians, was taken up. Dr. Hodge proposed that the question should be answered in the negative, and gave some account of the deposition of Davis. Took the ground that a deposed minister clearly had no power to ordain. Dr. Ely proposed to amend, so that it should be left to the discretion of the pastor and session. Dr. Hodge offered some objections to this plan. Dr. Ely moved to commit. Dr. Miller opposed this; thought the course adapted to do harm. If you commit this, you do in fact commit the question, "Shall our people be encouraged to go and receive sealing ordinances from mere laymen?" Dr. Hodge hoped that, if it were desirable to avoid a decision, indefinite postponement would be adopted. Earnestly hoped, however, that General Assembly would decide in the negative.

*Saturday, May 18, 9 o'clock A. M.* Opened with prayer.

The following persons were declared to be duly elected as delegates to corresponding bodies, viz: Rev. B. H. Rice, D. D., Rev. H. G. Ludlow, and Rev. Dr. M'Carter to the General Association of Connecticut. Rev. Dr. Rice and Mr. Ludlow to Massachusetts. Rev. Dr. Rice to Rhode-Island. Rev. Dr. M'Carter to Maine. Rev. Mr. Patterson to New-Hampshire and Vermont, and Rev. R. Smith his alternate. Rev. Dr. Spring and Mr. Boyd to Reformed Dutch Church. Rev. B. F. Stanton the alternate of Dr. Spring, and Mr. Ananias Platt the alternate of Mr. Boyd. Messrs. Foote and Junkin to the German Reformed Church, and Mr. Riddle the alternate of either.

The discussion interrupted last evening was resumed. Dr. Chapman opposed the reference.

Dr. M'Carter opposed the reference, because, as a general rule, we ought to decide the questions which are proposed to us.

Mr. White of New-York read a paper purporting that no one not baptised by a regular minister of the gospel should be considered as thus entitled.

Mr. Plumer read from Digest page 94, &c.

The substance of Mr. Plumer's argument was, that by answering in the negative we should exclude many dear people of God; stated cases, and declared that he had in these matters a higher responsibility than to the decisions of the General Assembly.

Mr. Ludlow opposed the reference. Believed that few in the house agreed with the last speaker. This was the case of a wicked man *out of commission*, and even if he were as holy as Paul, his acts would have no validity without restoration to office. There must be order in the church of God. Instanced the case of persons of piety inveigled into Unitarian churches. Persons not baptised must not be admitted to communion.

Dr. Ely withdrew the motion for commitment. The debate then proceeded on the original motion to answer in the negative.

Dr. Ely referred to the opinion of Robert Hall, that baptism is not a necessary pre-requisite. Apostles were perhaps not baptised. Dr. John M. Mason's opinion was cited. What is to be done with those who, after having been regularly admitted to the Presbyterian church, go over to the followers of Davis, and yet apply to us for occasional communion?

Dr. Green said he was opposed to what he could not name otherwise than by calling it the omnipotence of the session. Took a case of an avowed Unitarian admitted by a session. Feared it might not always be an imaginary case. Would the Presbytery have no right to control the session. Could not the Synod, or the General Assembly take it up? The opposite doctrine is monstrous.

Mr. Ludlow offered some highly impressive remarks against the license pleaded for.

Dr. Spring offered resolutions, first answering in the negative, but then leaving sessions to determine how far discipline should extend.

Mr. Lathrop, in favor of committing, opposed Dr. Spring's resolutions. Was delighted that there were no shades of party visible since the commencement of our sessions. The whole subject was committed.

The Synod of the Western Reserve, agreeably to the directions of the last Assembly, made a report concerning the charge against them, that they had no ruling elders in some churches, and also that they had received ministers without the necessary engagements. The substance was, that they acknowledged no prevalence of the abuses charged. In the case of elders, we understood the report to declare that the Synod did not believe the Constitution to make them essential to the existence of a church. The report was committed to Dr. M'Cartee, Mr. Judd, and Richard D. Haynes.

Committee of Overtures reported No's. 6 and 7.

*Monday, May 20th, 9 o'clock A. M.*

The 21st Annual Report of the Directors of the Theological Seminary at Princeton was received, and committed to Messrs. Winchester, D. Axtell, Jehiel Talmadge and Mr. Squier.

We learn that there have been received during the year 66 students; the highest number at any one time in attendance on lectures, was 138; the number at present, 127; certificates of having finished the whole course have been given to 8 young men.

Dr. Spring as chairman of the Committee on Overtures, read the document No. 1, and proposed its indefinite postponement. Carried, *nem. con.*

Overture No. 10, being a memorial and petition for the erection of a new Synod, to be called the Synod of the Chesapeake, was taken up, and after a highly animated debate was finally granted.

*Tuesday, May 21st, 9 o'clock, A. M.*

The papers relative to the difficulties in the Synods of Philadelphia and Cincinnati were referred to a committee consisting of Messrs. Spring, Hodge, Ludlow, Jessup and Wilkisson, to endeavor, if practicable, to effect a reconciliation between the parties concerned.

(To be continued.)

## ART. VII. Anniversaries.

*New-York Southern Sunday School Union.*—The number of pupils in the various schools under the direction of the Society is 29,533, of which number 1,500 have been enrolled during the past year. The number of teachers and pupils who have embraced religion during the past year is 591. The receipts of the Society, from the same period, were \$1,043, and its expenditures \$1,628.

*New-York Sunday School Union.*—The number of schools connected with the Union is 68, all having a male and female department except two. Teachers 2,014; of whom 1,039 are females. Scholars 13,484; of whom 242 are professors of religion. The number of libraries is 36, containing an aggregate of 16,490 volumes. There has been an increase, during the year of 185 teachers, and 1,749 scholars. Three thousand Bibles, being a donation from the American Bible Society, have been distributed among the schools within the same period.

*Exhibition of the Deaf and Dumb.*—This exhibition attracted as great a crowd at the Chatham street Chapel last evening, as was ever brought together there, on any occasion. The whole number of deaf and dumb in the State at the present time, is about 900; and even on the supposition that it will remain stationary, there will always be 150 of suitable age for instruction. The whole number now under tuition is 96. During the intervals of the usual course of instruction, lectures by signs on various subjects are to be given to the pupils by the professors. The young men are also taught various trades, and the girls are instructed in plain and ornamental needle work, household affairs, &c.

*American Bible Society.*—The receipts amount to \$84,935.48; of which sum \$37,494.37 were in payment for books; \$4,190.57 from legacies; \$8,572.53 as donations towards the general supply; \$1,327.60 towards the foreign distributions, and \$20,070.96 ordinary donations; the remainder from other sources. The expenditures during the year are \$86,362.76, being \$1,427.28 more than the amount received.

It was mentioned in the last report that the managers were about to prepare plates for a new quarto, royal octavo, and duodecimo Reference Bible. Those for the two former are now completed; the others will soon be ready, and copies from them will be prepared as early as possible—probably by September next.

Plates for a Modern Greek New-Testament are cast, and are in the hands of a Modern Greek scholar for correction. Books from them will soon be prepared and despatched to Greece.

*American Tract Society.*—The total amount of receipts during the year is \$62,443.50; expenditures during the same period \$62,339.18. Balance in the treasury, \$104.32.

*The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.*—The Board had 12 missions, embracing 55 stations. Of these stations seven are in India, two in South Eastern Asia, four in the Mediterranean, seven in the Sandwich Islands, twenty-seven among our Southwestern Indians, and four among the Indians of the State of New-York. The number of ordained missionaries was 75; of physicians, 4; of printers, 4; teachers, 18; farmers and mechanics, 20; females, married and single, 131—making a total of 252 laborers sent out from this country. In addition to these there were four native preachers, thirty native assistants, catechists, &c., and 1,275 schools, embracing 69,824 scholars.